APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,222	02/06/2002	Chih-Hao Hsu	20128.0011U1	7690

24504	7590	03/28/2005

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER
SHIN, KYUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td colspan="2">Application No.</td><td colspan="2">Applicant(s)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">10/068,222</td><td colspan="2">HSU ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">**Office Action Summary**</td><td>Examiner</td><td></td><td>Art Unit</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Kyung H Shin</td><td></td><td>2143</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 February 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2 16 02 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:

          1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

          2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

          3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

               application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed 2/2/2002

2. Claims **1 - 12** are pending. Independent claim is **1** and **7.**

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language..

4. Claims 1 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable

over Walker (US Patent No. 2002/0065848).

Regarding Claim 1, Walker discloses a method of storing data for a

collaboration system wherein first and second data are respectively used for

implementation of a plurality of child processes and a parent process comprising

the child processes, the method comprising the steps of:

  a) storing the first and second data; (see paragraph [0049], lines 4-8;

      paragraph [0056], lines 1-4; paragraph [0187], lines 2-5: workspace

      database (i.e. first data), user database (i.e. second data))

b) storing a link in the first data; (see paragraph [0189], lines 23-30: link (link: workspace_owner) stored within workspace database (i.e. first data)) and

c) linking the first and second data by the link. (see paragraph [0067], lines 1-6; paragraph [0189], lines 23-30; paragraph [0191], lines 16-26: member linked list, workspace database (i.e. first data) linked to user database (i.e. second data)), first data link: workspace_owner, second data link: user_handle)

Regarding Claims 2, 8, Walker discloses the method as claimed in claims 1, 7 wherein the second data comprises identification of the child processes. (see paragraph [0187], lines 7-37: user database (i.e. second data) designates identification information for client (i.e. child) or user processes)

Regarding Claims 3, 9, Walker discloses the method as claimed in claims 1, 7 wherein the first and second data comprise identification of participants in the child and parent processes. (see paragraph [0050], lines 1-3; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3; paragraph [0189], lines 8-34; paragraph [0191], lines 4-13: workspace (i.e. parent) processes and client (i.e. child) processes identifies connected user and workspace participants)

Regarding Claim 4, Walker discloses the method as claimed in claim 3 further comprising the steps of:

a) storing a second link in the first data; (see paragraph [0189], lines 8-13: link (link: workspace_id) stored within workspace database (i.e. first data)) and

b) linking the identification of the participants in the child and parent processes by the second link. (see paragraph [0067], lines 1-6; paragraph [0189], lines 8-13; paragraph [0187], lines 36-37: member linked list links workspace (i.e. parent) and client (i.e. child), workspace database (i.e. first data) linked to user database (i.e. second data), first data link: workspace_id, second data link: user_workspace_list)

Regarding Claims 5, 11, Walker discloses the method as claimed in claims 1, 7 wherein the first and second data comprise messages generated in the child and parent processes. (see paragraph [0052], lines 2-5: data structure used to store information concerning documents (messages) generated by client (i.e. child) processes within workspace (i.e. parent))

Regarding Claim 6, Walker discloses the method as claimed in claim 5 further comprising the steps of:

a) storing a third link in the first data; (see paragraph [0189], lines 14-16: workspace database (i.e. first data) utilizing a link (i.e. workspace_title)) and

b) linking the messages generated in the child and parent processes by the third link. (see paragraph [0025], lines 11-14 paragraph [0108], line 4; paragraph [0189], line 14-16: workspace (i.e. parent) and client (i.e. child)

processes manipulating documents (i.e. messages) utilizing links (first

data link: summary_title, second data link: workspace_title))

Regarding Claim 7, Walker discloses a collaboration system comprising:

a) a collaboration center (see paragraph [0011], lines 1-6: collaborative

system for simultaneous manipulation of documents (i.e. messages) by

multiple users (i.e. clients)) obtaining first data for implementation of a

parent process comprising a plurality of child processes; (see paragraph

[0050], lines 1-3; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: workspace (i.e. parent)

process and multiple client (i.e. child) or user processes utilized)

b) a member obtaining second data for implementation of the child

processes; (see paragraph [0237], lines 1-5: user_handle (i.e. second

data item) accessed to implement client (i.e. child) process) and

c) a storage device storing the first and second data (see paragraph [0049],

lines 4-8; paragraph [0056], lines 1-4; paragraph [0187], lines 2-5:

workspace database (i.e. first data), user database (i.e. second data), and

storing a link in the second data to link the first and second data.   (see

paragraph [0067], lines 1-6; paragraph [0189], lines 23-30; paragraph

[0191], lines 16-26: member linked list linking workspaces and clients (i.e.

members), workspace database (i.e. first data) linked to user database

(i.e. second data)), second data link: user_handle, first data link:

workspace_owner)

Regarding Claim 10, Walker discloses the collaboration system as claimed in claim 9 wherein the storage device further stores a second link in the second data to link the identification of the participants in the parent and child processes. (see paragraph [0067], lines 1-6; paragraph [0189], lines 8-13; paragraph [0187], lines 36-37: member linked list linking workspaces and clients (i.e. members), workspace database (i.e. first data) linked to user database (i.e. second data)), second data link: user_workspace_list, first data link: workspace_id)

Regarding Claim 12, Walker discloses the collaboration system as claimed in claim 11 wherein the storage device further stores a third link in the second data to link the messages generated in the parent and child processes. (see paragraph [0189], lines 14-16: workspace database (i.e. first data) utilizing a link (second data link: workspace_title))

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-
direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-
free).

KHS
Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
Mar. 10, 2005